

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the final Office Action mailed August 31, 2007. Claims 1-20 were examined. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No claims are canceled and no new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 101

The Office Action rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Paragraph 7 of the Specification has been amended to address this rejection and withdrawal is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9, 11-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,113 to Alegre (hereinafter referred to as “Alegre”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Because of the complexity of the system of Alegre, there is not a one-to-one relationship between the steps and components of Alegre and those of the claimed invention. Many of the passages cited in the Office Action in support of the rejections are very long and cover numerous steps involving numerous components and the Office Action frequently lacks sufficient precision for the Applicant to adequately understand the rejections. This results in some

confusion as to which component or step of Alegre is being referred to and which component or step of a claim in the Office Action.

Specifically, the Office Action cites one passage of Alegre (column 4, lines 17-23) as teaching all of the elements of the first paragraph of claim 1 (“generating session information at a control node in response to a request from a client to access a system node and sending the session information to the client, the system node, and a data node if the client and system node satisfy at least one condition for accessing each other”). However, it is difficult to determine which component of Alegre is believed to be comparable to which component of the invention recited in this paragraph of claim 1. In particular, the Office Action does not indicate which components of Alegre are the functional equivalents of the data node and the system node of claim 1. Moreover, the cited passage only teaches that the user sends a request from a client browser to the web host when the user wants to access the trusted network. There is no teaching that session information is generated (at a control node or any other location) or it is sent anywhere, including to the client, the system node and the data node. Additionally, in the system of Alegre, only the user is required to be authenticated. There is no teaching that both the client and the system node must be authenticated (satisfy at least one condition for accessing each other).

With respect to the second paragraph of claim 1, the Office Action cites column 4, lines 31-39 and lines 43-48. The first of the two passages is directed towards the authentication server validating user authentication information and requesting a session key from a key server. The second of the two

passages is directed towards the web host sending presentation information to the client browser. Neither of the passages, nor the combination of the two, teaches that “a request [is received at the data node] from the client to access the system node and a request is received [at the data node] from the system node to access the client.”

With respect to the third paragraph of claim 1, the Office Action cites column 4, lines 48-67. Neither the cited passage nor any other passage in Alegre teaches or suggests the establishment of “a first secure authenticated connection between the client and the system node via the data node based at least in part on the session information.”

In summary, the process and system of Alegre is far more complicated than the claimed invention and, more importantly, does not perform the same functions. Consequently, claim 1 is not anticipated by Alegre.

With respect to the rejection of claim 2, the Office Action refers to forty-one lines of column 7 covering four paragraphs (line 2-43) as teaching the single step that a request is received at the control node from the client for the session information. A more specific reference would have assisted the Applicant in addressing this rejection and the Applicant is unable to find the claimed step in the passage. Consequently, claim 2 is not anticipated by Alegre.

With respect to claim 3, the cited passage of Alegre fails to disclose registering the system node with the control node. The passage only discusses authenticating the user and, therefore, does anticipate claim 3.

With respect to claim 4, again the passage cited in the Office Action which is said to teach the claimed step is extremely long and covers numerous aspects of the invention of Alegre, particularly the manner in which packets are created in response to requests for information from the user. Therefore, the passage does not teach that multiple system nodes are registered, does not teach the existence of a list of registered system nodes, does not teach that the list is provided to the client and does not teach that the desired system node is selected from the list.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, the cited passage of Alegre is directed to processing a session key. The mere fact that data of various kinds is transferred among the numerous components of Alegre over various links does not mean that Alegre teaches that specific data (a message from the client) is transferred between two specific components (from the client to the system node) through a third specific component (the data node) over a specific link (the second secure authenticated connection).

Consequently, claims 1-7 are not anticipated by Alegre. Independent claims 8 and 12 and their respective dependent claims 8, 9 and 11 and claims 13 and 16-20 were rejected on the same grounds as cited for the rejection of claims 1-7. The forgoing traverse of the rejection of claims 1-7 apply equally to the other rejected claims and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,243,369 to Bhat, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Bhat”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The passage of Bhat cited in the Office Action, column 4, lines 1-9, in support of this rejection states:

This system provides access to a list of URLs to Internet applications resources and services in a corporate directory server system. In one embodiment, of the present invention, the URL access control system includes an authentication service system that authenticates user access requests. The user access request is typically directed to protected web-based software applications and services which may be specific to an organization or an entity.

The passage is directed to a list of URLs. There is no indication that the system of Bhat includes a client database at the control node, that the database contains a dynamic network address for the system node or that the database is updated on a recurring basis. Consequently, claim 10 is not rendered obvious by the cited references.

The Office Action rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0093674 to Ferlitsch (hereinafter referred to as “Ferlitsch”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Ferlitsch is directed to “providing

computer users with fax services” (Abstract, line 1) and fax service is not art which is analogous to building automation. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art of building automation would not look to references pertaining to fax services to assist with building automation issues and Ferlitsch should not be cited in support of a rejection of building automation claims.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that “[enabling] the client to change current preferences for receiving service” provides the motivation to combine Alegre with Ferlitsch. However, claims 14 and 15 pertain to the contents of the session information, not changing current preferences and therefore such motivation is irrelevant to the claims. The Applicant would also like to point out the full context of the Ferlitsch passage: a user is allowed to “change the fax number and current preferences for receiving faxes if inactive.” Again, one of ordinary skill in the art of building automation would not look to a reference on changing fax preferences. Finally, neither Alegre nor Ferlitsch discusses the status of a system node, much less including the status of the system node in session information as recited in claim 15. Consequently, claims 14 and 15 are not rendered obvious by the cited references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the independent claims 1, 8 and 12 are believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of those claims. The dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-20 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 28, 2007

By: /peterbscull/

Peter B. Scull
Reg. No. 37,932
(303) 592-8378